/44 cont./

59 so great, and there are, besides the linear families or nonnamed minimal lineages, some independent families (i.e., rather Ll, often Ss and In, instead of Ee; column 7), which agrees with the fact that, besides the customary matrilocal marriage, "neolocal" residence is found (Mn, instead of Mm; column 8) in the dry season on the one hand, and, on the other hand, as a possible
595 nucleus of a new extended family. Polygyny is neither frequent
583 nor favored, whereas it is true that material considerations are absent on the occasion of marriage (thus Mo or To rather than Lo; column 9).

611 We shall now take up the most confused aspect of Carajá
[121] ethnography. The Handbook of South American Indians speaks
615 correctly of double descent. I have shown elsewhere that be-
[114] cause of some inattention in the editing of the famous manual, an incorrect idea of the real nature of this coexistence of patrilineal and matrilineal groupings has arisen. It is a matter, not of moieties, but of three large, named, patrilineal groups, which are primarily the men's affair, in their ceremonial and political life, but nevertheless are concerned with women in the sense of an endogamous tendency. Thus it is not a matter of true parallel descent, and, on the other hand, it is by no
[621] means a question of exogamy, and still less of moieties. At the most one may speak of nonexogamy or agamy as in the case of the villages, which are themselves matrilineal groupings on account of the matrilocal rule of the domestic group just men-
613 tioned. In a strict sense only the small extended family,
596 which can be described as a non-named, minimal, matrilineal
582 lineage, seems to be exogamous. Marriage is permitted with any cousin, parallel or cross, and the matrilateral preference reported by Lipkind (incidentally without any indication of whether it is a matter of parallel or cross cousins!) seems to be only the normative expression of matrilocal marriage, whereas the slight patrilateral preference ascertained by myself is equally in agreement with the rule of endogamy of the patrilineal groups.
[601] In reality, since the relatives are usually "brother" and "sister" with regard to each other, being male and female cousin, as we

/44 cont./

582 shall presently see, the difference does not have much explicative value. In the light of what has been said, it is therefore [616] necessary to correct the categories set up by Murdock, taking [615] into account the fact that his category "agamous (nonexogamous) [114] moieties" should be completed by "agamous phratries" (thus: Pa or Na, La, Da; columns 10-12).

●601 The kinship system of the Carajá must now be set forth for the first time, albeit briefly. Murdock left the pertinent [114] column completely blank. /45/ With regard to male and female cousins, the terminology is of the "Hawaii" type, that is to say, my own generation contains only brothers and sisters. 128 Before continuing, permit me to remind you that we have been able to speak of principles which govern kinship systems. In order not to fall into the trap of "verbalism" decried by Murdock, I hasten to add that it is not a question of causes, but rather of logical principles likely to operate in view of a given situation, whether these be circumstances pertaining to the environment, demography, or the fundamental type of social communication which is involved in each case. Now we could pair up these principles by forming contrasts in the manner of the linguists, contrasts whose terms exclude each other when it is a question of particular relations, but which can alternatively be combined into a whole system of kinship relations. Perhaps it would be preferable to formulate only opposite contrasts, but for the moment I will be satisfied, except in the first case, with contrasts which are clearly contradictory, and thus easier to handle, for that will suffice to attain our immediate goal of elucidating 601 the kinship system of the Carajá. There is contradiction between the classified unity of the generation and the unity of the line of filiation, there is contradiction between differentiation and nondifferentiation of the sexes, as well as of respective ages, between reciprocity and nonreciprocity of terms, finally between classificatory unity and nonunity of brothers and sisters — classificatory unity which, by the way, is not to be confused with the unity of the group of brothers and sisters classified together, nor with a denominative unity.

/45 cont./

601 With regard to the terminology of cousins, we are concerned here with the principle of the unity of the generation and that of the differentiation of the sexes, which remains true for the generation of the grandparents. Between brothers and sisters, to be more precise (and this is naturally valid for male and female cousins), there is only a partial differentiation of the sexes and of the respective ages, just as there is only a partial classificatory unity of the brothers and sisters (and, consequently, of male and female cousins). The terms used for the "parallel" uncles and aunts, on the other hand, are of mixed type according to the relative ages (relative to the parents), the designations for the eldest ones being derived from the terms "father" and "mother," those for the younger ones being from the same root as the words used for designating the grandparents, which, for that matter, is the case for the "cross" uncle and aunt, who, for their part, are not differentiated according to their respective ages. It is evident that there is a tendency to [587] reunite the generation of the parents and to bring it closer to the generation of the grandparents, with an exception being made for the parents themselves, as well as for the oldest brother of the father and for the oldest sister of the mother, for whom the terms are derived from those for the parents — here the levirate and the sororate certainly play their part, and the nuclear family is taken separately. In Murdock's classification it is thus a matter, so far as the uncles (and the aunts) are concerned, of a linear terminology and "bifurcate merging," respectively, and in both cases, derived (Hn and l; column 13). It must be added that the classificatory unity of brothers and sisters comes into play.

The most striking example of this classificatory unity is shown in an exceptional type of designation for nephews and nieces. A brother and a sister use, it is true, without distinguishing the sex, two different words which we shall translate "nephew-niece," but what is more essential is that both of them conjointly call the children of their brother "son" and "daughter,"

/45 cont./

601 the children of their sister "nephew-niece" (without distinction as to sex). This only makes sense if one wishes to emphasize, along with the unity of the brothers and sisters, the unity of a patrilineal minimal lineage, the children of a sister then belonging to another small exogamic patrilineal group. Now, at present, there is no patrilineal lineage. This would allow us to suppose an historic change from a patrilineal preponderance to a matrilineal preponderance, a change which would be expressed today in double descent. The kinship system which most emphasizes the unity of patrilineal lineage /46/ (of the mother) is the "Omaha" system, which, moreover, one could imagine as structured according to the principle of the classificatory unity of brothers and sisters, which is never the case so far as I know, but which would push the logic of this system to the extreme (the same statement would be valid for the "Crow" system, which marks the unity of the matrilineal lineage, this time of the father).

551 601 Now, brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law (as well as parents-in-law) are classified by "teknonymy," and since in the designation the reference "...of my child" seems to be customarily omitted, this is the same, for the husbands, as the way in which, in the "Omaha" system, the men designate their matrilateral male and female cross-cousins, and for the wives, as the manner of designation used by the women in the "Crow" system, when it is a matter of their patrilateral male and female cousins. I wonder whether there is not a connection between teknonymy in the broad sense and the types produced by linear or consecutive classification.

Teknonymy in the restricted sense, i.e., the terms "lord of so-and-so" and "source of so-and-so" used by a third person, is voluntarily chosen by the parents themselves. "Source of the grandchild" is the daughter-in-law, whereas the son-in-law is called "black-nephew" (the speech of the man being borrowed, this time, by his wife!). This would again be in accord with a historic state of patrilineal preponderance, if one does not

/46 cont./

551 wish to infer at the outset a marriage, formerly prescribed,
601 with the matrilateral female cross-cousin. One must remember,
[183] however, that the present state characterized by a great degree of freedom, in other words, by a degree of "information" or of greater entropy, is also found in the performance of ceremonies, such as in the narration of myths and legends, these expressions of the spiritual life of the Carajá which allow great freedom of variation around a principal theme stubbornly preserved. — Finally teknonymy guides the reciprocal terms of grandparents and grandchildren, so that the grandparents, designated according to their sex, reply by the same word, even if the grandchild is of the opposite sex.

561 Before finishing my article, I must quickly touch on the
554 last two columns of Murdock's attempt. The Carajá distinguish,
615 by speech and by ornaments, age grades. At the same time, an idea of stratification is outlined in the fact that political and religious roles are the heritage of only one of the three patrilineal groups with an endogamous tendency. It is tempting to think
[567] of the classes or castes of the Guaycurú /Guaicuru/, for example, and since there are reports which speak of temporary slaves, Murdock's information in this direction must be corrected (Ai, with a tendency towards Ci, instead of O; column 14). The
628 villages are politically autonomous, but the Carajá themselves
621 unite some villages in amphictyonies for the performance of
622 certain ceremonies. The hereditary succession of the chiefs
621 goes in the patrilineal line, a grandson being chosen as the candidate, or, if one is lacking, a granddaughter. Consequent-
[178] ly, there is a temporary matrilineal succession in the heart of the patrilineal group, for which there is reserved the role of the chief, who, incidentally, is on the way to complete disappearance (thus: Pp and m, for the Carajá themselves, Ap and m for the Javahé and Chambioá /Shambioa/; column 15).

121 You would not wish me to end on this melancholy note.
[178] I repeat: a people small in number and too little known, despite appearances, is in the process of losing at least its traditional aspect, which would have been fascinating for comparative sociology as well as for the history of the South American Indians.